

ADMINISTRATIVE - INTERNAL USE ONLY

15 August 1972

MEMORANDUM FOR: Deputy Director of Training

SUBJECT : History of the JOT Program, 1950-1966

STATINTL

1. Generally, I think this history is well-written and comprehensive. I am very familiar with the records from which this history was drawn as it was my final task with the Career Training Program to compile and arrange them for the historian. To the extent that it relies on these records it is surprisingly accurate, indicating a high degree of research and selective judgment. His recognition of the invaluable assistance provided by [] is commendable and most certainly deserved.

2. On the other hand, in those many instances in which the writer has resorted to recollections of his own involvement, and to judgments which evolve therefrom, the text is much less objective and reliable. Many of his comments are totally gratuitous and inappropriate.

3. Although I have not had opportunity to review the text completely, I note some significant inaccuracies and omissions:

a. Recruitment - on page 73 of the manuscript, the statement is made that the recruiting problem was still unsolved at the end of the 1950-66 period, but vanished in the five-year period afterward because of the diminished demand for graduates of the Program. This is an egregious error, underscored by the fact that in 1967 the largest number of trainees in the history of the Program was enrolled. And even in 1972, though smaller, the Program cannot satisfy the demand because of budgetary and ceiling restrictions placed upon it. Even the reason for its diminished size is different from that suggested by the author.

ADMINISTRATIVE - INTERNAL USE ONLY

b. Maintenance of High Qualitative Standards - There are ample records in the files of the CT Program to demonstrate that with the expansion of the Program, beginning in October 1964, standards for selection were not maintained, but rather were violated in a significant number of cases in order to meet recruitment goals established for Fiscal Years 1965-68. The judgment made at the top of page 100 is substantiated neither by the Program records nor by the experience of supervisors throughout the Agency who communicated to us their gradual displeasure that graduates of the Program 'were not what they used to be'.

c. Career Trainees and the DDS - The coverage of this subject on pages 126-129 is far from complete. What it does not say, perhaps out of reverence for senior officials of the Support Directorate, is that the program initiated so earnestly and massively in 1964 to send JOT's/CT's to the Support Services, collapsed almost completely by late 1966 when the career development programs, rotational tours overseas, and promotional opportunities which had been planned for these trainees were abandoned.

d. Program Coordinator - The author, as Chief of the Intelligence School during the periods when JOT Program Coordinators were functioning, opposed the entire concept, a point he readily admits in the manuscript by declaring there was no need for them. In reality, the need was overwhelming and had been recognized by the Inspector General in reports so freely alluded to elsewhere in this history. The undersigned performed this function on a somewhat modified basis, beginning in 1967, simply because of a continuing lack of coordination among the Schools and Staffs within OTR dealing with the JOT training cycle. Specifically, throughout the 1960's there had been ongoing problems having to do with:

1) the same lecturer making the same presentation to the same class but in a different course;

2) conflicting training objectives and techniques between courses; the most graphic illustration of this is contained in a vitriolic exchange of memoranda between the author of the JOT Program history and a Deputy Chief [redacted]

[redacted] over the quality of the writing instruction given by their respective staffs;

STATINTL

STATINT

ADMINISTRATIVE - INTERNAL USE ONLY

STATINTL

3) frequent dispute between OTR components over scheduling the JOT training cycle, especially during the summer months. The problems of coordination have been all too real and if [redacted] were less than completely successful in their attempts to solve them, the fault was not entirely theirs. I think the harsh judgments visited on these men by the author are unwarranted.

4. Some of the author's statements which carry beyond 1966 are gross generalizations which, at the very least, convey a wrong impression and, at worst, are erroneous. The historian of the post-1966 period should not be faced with the burden of prejudgments and I think all references to this period should be excised from the manuscript, including footnote references.

5. Finally, the selection of Appendices strikes me as curious. More basic documents which actually governed the day-to-day operations of the Program might have been included, if any were to be included at all. Sorely missing, it seems to me, are statistical compilations showing the numbers of trainees selected, annually and cumulatively, Internals and Externals, numbers assigned by Directorates, retention and attrition factors, etc. Not only would these provide better overall perspective, but they would also constitute useful background for the specific topics treated in the narrative.

[redacted] STATINT